App. F. IX-4

Previous References 1934 (Temp)

File No. 3/S-40.

Serial Nos. 1-3

Later References. PRESERVE

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 2

Part B for April 1941.

SUBJECT.

Transferred to the affairs of the Treasury Board, O.S. 9 of 39-40, upon the file of the Disbursement Branch Treasury Board.

402309-11 of 20.3.00

WD-0573-GPB—22,500—12-9-39

Soumis à l'approbation.

28-4-41

Serial No.

Letter no C 1241/39. LO dated 22nd Aug. 1940 from the Bombay Commissioner requesting that the opinion of the Law department regarding the further action to be taken in the matter may be obtained and communicated.

A reference to the District Court had been made under Section 13 of the Mysore Religious and Charitable institutions Act of 1927 regarding the mismanaged affairs of the Lingayat Mutt at Devanur

The case was registered as O.S no 9 of 39-40 on the file of the District Judge Mysore. It is stated that the same is posted to the 27th instant (to-day). It is also stated in the P.U.D that the public prosecutor Mysore has been instructed to take a short-adjournment if orders of Govt could not be communicated in time

The reference is now proposed to be withdrawn and fresh action taken under Section 25 of the Religious and Charitable Institutions Act

Copies of letters from the DC. Mysore and the PP Mysore District and a copy of the statement filed by defendants 1 to 4 were also enclosed for reference.

Submitted for orders.

Attached is Draft at Page 11

27/8 & 19 of the File below also is the Mysore Court (vide Page 7 & 8) A perusal of the D.O letter flagged "B" shows that the Institution

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

1264.

File No. of 194 . | General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

a question is a charitable & religious trust. But letter 'G' of the Nagpur Com" read thus :- "It is seen from the detailed enquiry made by the Collector & from the reports of the S.D.O. & the D.C. .... that it has not been possible to establish definitely whether the trust & its properties constitute charitable or religious trust within the meaning of the Nagpur Religious & Charitable Trust Act of 1927." These are conflicting statements.

Further, the S.C. is of opinion that action cannot be taken under Sec 25 clause (2) of the Act, but the P.R. is of opinion that such an action can be taken. We may do these two officers differ on a question of Law but they also differ on a question of fact - one letter to each

It is therefore very difficult for us to give any definite opinion on the matter, unless the Nagpur Commissioner sends us all the [illegible] records necessary to arrive at a decision.

The S.C. suggests that the G.P. may be consulted in this matter. It is better that the file be sent to the Govt Advocate for his opinion & the Nagpur Com be requested to take [illegible] enquiry, say for a month, in this case. The Nagpur Com" may be also asked to send us all the connected records together with the pleadings in the case, as they are essential for us to arrive at a decision in the case.

Law Secretary 3 28/8/40

Put up a draft to the Nagpur Com A/c one month 3 29/8/40

Hon 2 2 8 0

1264 J 1489

Mismanaged affs of the Lingayat Mutt at Devanur - Ranganad Taluk

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. | of 194 | [App. F III-2

Serial No.

Draft to the Hony Court submitted for approval.

29/8

29/8

P. 1246 & 1247 issued to the Hony Court and PPs Members on 31/8/60

Letter no. 478 dated 31st August 1960 from the Public Prosecutor Mysore Original Petition, and the records in the case have been filed in court and pleading papers of both the parties may kindly be returned for court and sent to Govt

Copy of the letter of reference together with its enclosures and the Copy of the written statement are also submitted for reference.

Date of hearing 8th September 1960.

It is stated that the case now stands posted to the 18th instant for filing of reply.

P W.D. I and II are submitted for orders.

3/9

The P.Pr. be requested to get back all the relevant records access to the persons giving out as a decree as the point of issue of persons in the case, & to send them to Govt., the may be requested to take a results adjournment in the Case.

Addl Secretary) 3/9/60

Hm 3/9/60

Put up a draft as above Secy

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

1489

Mismanaged affairs of the Lingayat Mutt at Devanur

Cos no 90 of 39-40 on the file of the District Judge, Mysore

File No. of 194 . | General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

Next date of hearing 18th September 19

TYPING SECTION 3 SEP. 1940 GEN. & REV. SECTT.

Jus. A

Draft submitted for approval.

3/9

3/9

3/9

P Nos 1 to 4 in the respective Dist Cts 30 Sept 40.

Letter no. 558/dated 14th September 1940 from the P.P. Mysore submitting for reference and return four files of records and a book connected with the above case.

The pleadings in the case were received with P U·D II

The public prosecutor Mysore District has now forwarded the original records in the case which he has taken back from court, for reference and return four files and a book are received with P.U.D IV

P U·D I is submitted for orders.

17/9

It is at the request of the D.C. that in his statement as a question of fact & & made the reference under Sec 13 of the Mysore Inquiries Act which was sanctioned by Govt vide pg 'H'

2/9 Letter of the D C Hospet

2 [redacted] is pensioned, his finding as a question of fact — whether the institution is or is not a charitable institution — differs from the finding given in the letter Hospet 'H'. The D.C now advises that there is no evidence to prove that the institution is a Charitable & Religious Inst. Hence a reference under Sec 13 of the Act is not called for, in this proceedings alone, but maintainable.

Serial No.

Thus, so far, as the question of the non-ascertainability of the present suit is concerned, there can be no two opinions, provided the finding of the D.C. on the fact that the Institution is a Religious Charitable Trust, is correct.

But the contention of the Defendants is that the Institution does not constitute a religious or charitable Trust within the meaning of the Act. Hence the finding of the D.C. is challenged by the Appellants. (vide letter 'A')

Further, the D.C. is of opinion that the Institution is a Math - Decree the Appellants & Plaintiff that it is a "Samadhi". Hence there is dispute on this question of fact also. (vide letter 'A').

So on two points - there is a dispute - (1) 1° - whether the Institution constitutes a Religious & Charitable Trust - & 2° - whether it is a Math or a Samadhi.

Whether the Institution is a Math or a Samadhi is not so very important, as in other words (viz), whether it is a Trust - & not - the Institution is a Samadhi -

Appellants - Hence the question is, whether a Religious & Charitable Trust has at least can be done by a Religious Act.

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

File No. of 194 . | General Secretariat

Serial No.

In present case by withdrawal, I cannot understand in reference except Sec 13 of Act, as the admitted fact of the Advocate General that the Institution is a Mutt, and is maintained, it will be very necessary for him to file an Application for any order of Court in the matter of the Institution which is a Charitable & Religious Trust or Mutt. If the Court decides this question in any manner, then the Inspector General can withdraw under Sections 11 & 18 of the Act, & seek suitable orders.

The D.C. wants to withdraw the present case on the assumption that the Institution in question is a Mutt — but this fact is disputed. Hence if action is taken by the D.C. under Section 25 or Sec 26 of the Act, the Inspector will move it as above-mentioned.

Hence my opinion is that the present Application may continue, & the Court may direct the Inspector General to file a suitable Comp. Petition after an Issue (3) whether the Institution is or is not a Charitable & Religious Mutt.

Law Secretary. 3
18/9/40

It is necessary that a judicial pronouncement be obtained in the case already filed. There is no necessity to withdraw the reference at this stage, as the defendants contest that the institution is not a Mutt and not a Public Charitable or Religious Institution.

Serial No.

Hence a reference under S 13 of the Act is quite proper.

II Member)

Hm 18/9/40

3 18/9/40

J.C. 19.9.40

2770 18.9.40

Hm 19/9/40

Returned with records

3 19/9/40.

Draft to the Mysore Court submitted for approval

Hm 3 19/9

Hm 3 19/9

P. 1656/Law dated 19th September issued to the Munsif Court at Mysore / Bangalore.

P. 1657/Law copy of letter to the Munsif Court sent to the Public Prosecutor Mysore together with the records received from him

4th September 1940

Serial No.

Letter no 1331 dated 13th January 1941 from the P.P. Chittoor intimating that the above case was dismissed and stating that he will obtain & send the certified copies of the order passed in the case

Orders have been obtained on the letter of the P.P. to await the receipt of the certified copy of the order passed in the case on 29/1/41

Xerox

Letter no C 1241 dated 4th March 1941 from the Munsey Court forwarding for sanction the bill of the P.P. Chittoor in the above case and also requesting that sanction may be accorded for taking action under Section 26 of the Religious and charitable Institutions Act.

Sanction for making the reference to the District Court and sanction regarding the advance to the P.P. in the case have both been worked up in the Municipal Branch

The public Prosecutor Chittoor District opines that this is not a fit case for being taken up in appeal and the Municipal Court seems to agree with him

The fee claimed by the P.P. in the case is in accordance with that allowed by the Court The other items of expenditure noted in the statement of accounts submitted by the P.P. are also found to be correct.

The Municipal Court now requests sanction of Govt on two points.

1) Payment of the bill of the P.P. Chittoor

Devanoor Mutt case.

Land Revenue Secretariat | File No. of 194 . | [App. F. III-2

Serial No.

2) holding an enquiry into the affairs of the Mutt under section 26 of the Religious and Charitable Institutions Act.

Submitted for orders if the file may be transferred to the Mangalore Branch for taking action on the two points raised by by the Mangalore Court in his letter dt 4th March 41

Sd/ 8/3

A / The Bill is in order — & as such it may be sanctioned by the Mangalore Branch

B / As regard holding an enquiry under sec 26 of the R & C. Act; the Mangalore Branch may be asked to

Bd/Secy Mangalore Br 10/3/41 3

(1) may be done.
As regards (2) the file may be requested to submit necessary proposals

Sd 10/3

Sd 2nd Member 11/3

Sd 12/3

Two drafts are submitted

Sd 13/3

BS 19/3 19/3

GENL & REV. SECTT. 10 MAR. 1941 1318 M.

GENERAL & REVENUE SECRETARY 10 MAR. 1941 1738

OFFICE OF THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL 11 MAR 1941 No. 8.8.16

TYPING SECTION 1 MAR. 1941 GEN. & REV. SECTT

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

	Serial No.
2309-11 dated 21 3.41 The Nigerian Com- communicating the decision of the Nigerian Government to meet the entire salary of the Civil Surgeon in the Cameroons from Nigerian funds, subject to Parliament's approval in due course	2
2312 dated 20-3-1941 The Nigerian Com- communicating decision to grant a holiday on 24th inst. to Treasurer Mr Shenton and the Clerk of Treasury and calling for proposals for the construction of the Cameroons Committee.	3

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE,

No. C. 39-40

ENCL. Nil

Bangalore, 4th March 1941.

FROM

RUKN-UL-MULK
S. ABDUL WAJID, B.A.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

5 MAR. 1941

To

H. V. Narayana Rao, Esq., B.A., LL.B.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Law *Department.*

SIR,

Management of the Affairs of the Lingayet Mutt at Devanur, Nanjangud Taluq - C.S.9 of 39-40 on the file of the District Judge, Mysore.

1838

With reference to your letter No.1056/Law dated 19-9-1940, conveying the instructions of Government on the above subject, I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of letter No.M.282/38 dated 11th February 1941, received from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, intimating that the suit instituted in the District Court, Mysore, under Section 13 of the Religious and Charitable Institutions Act, was dismissed on 11-1-1941, each party being allowed to bear his own costs. The public prosecutor is of opinion that there are no sufficient grounds for preferring an appeal; and he suggests that an enquiry as under Section 26 of the said Act may be instituted with the sanction of Government. Agreeing with this suggestion, the Deputy Commissioner reports that he will submit proposals, if approved.

2. The Deputy Commissioner, further, reports that the total charges of the litigation including the remuneration of Rs 25 due to the public prosecutor, as per his bill which is countersigned by the District Judge, Mysore, amounting to Rs 34-4-0; that, out of this, an ~~amount~~ advance of Rs 25 has been paid to the public prosecutor, as sanctioned in G.O.No.1788-90/Muz.205-39-2 dated 10-2-1940; and that the balance of Rs 9-4-0 still due to him may be sanctioned, the entire charges being met from the General Muzrai Funds.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Read —

UBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section. Mucg

File No. 315-40

Serial No. 2

iary No. of letter replied to..... 1318

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Date of issue 20-3- 1941

Signed by .....

Read— Govt. No 178-S-90/Mucg 205-39-2 dated 16.2.1941 Sanctioning an advance of Rs 25- from the Guard Mugrai funds to meet the incidental charges of the litigation involved in making a reference to the Hon'ble Mysore under Section 13 of the Mysore Religious and Order thereon.—No. Charitable Institutions Act-VII of 1927, about the alleged mismanagement of the affairs of the Linguyat Mutt at Devanahalli Bangalore Taluk

(2) letter No C1241/39-40 dated 6.3.1941 from the Mugrai Comm in Mysore reporting that

May this be—

(i) printed ?

(ii) treated as a standing order ?

(iii) published in the Gazette, English Part ?

(iv) translated ?

(v) placed at the disposal of the press ?

(vi) published in the Gazette, Kannada Part ?

suit instituted in the Ct. court Mysore
under Sec 3 of the Mysore Religious and
Charitable Institutions Act of 1927,
concerning the affairs of the dargah
Hazrat Sultan Bawa was dismissed
on 11.1.1941, each party being directed
to bear his own costs, that part of the
total charges of the litigation including
the remuneration of Rs 25 due to the
public prosecutor, as per his bill
countersigned by the Asst Judge
Mysore, amounting to Rs 34-4-0,
a sum of Rs 25- has been paid to
the P.P. leaving a balance of Rs 9-4-0
still due to him, and requesting
sanction to meet the entire
charges of Rs 34-4-0 (thirty four
rupees and four annas) only
as a advance from the Govt Revenue
Subject to adjustment in due course.

List of Enclosure

Copied by

Examined by

The recommendation of the Asst Commr

for D/3

J. Govt for [illegible]

The Hon. the Revenue Minister

W. 0576—GPB—22.500—22-3-37

ERNMEN S HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF

General and Revenue Secretariat.

NO. - 512 -

Dated, Bangalore, 20 March 1941.

Jury 315: 40-3

FROM

The Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

General Department.

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to para 5 of your letter No.C.1241/39-40 dated 4th March 1941, I am directed to convey the sanction of Government under Section 26 of the Mysore Religious and Charitabl Institutions Act of 1927, for holding an enquiry into the alleged mismanagement of the Lingayet mutt at Devanur in Nanjangud Taluk and to request that necessary proposals about the constitution of the Committee contemplated in the above statutory provision may b submitted for the orders of Government.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

for General Secretary to Government.

Aga/3.

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mang

File No. 315-40

Serial No. 3

Diary No. of letter replied to 1316

No. 2312

To

The Manager Comm

Sir,

With reference to para 3 of your letter No e 1241/B9 dated 4.3.1941, I am directed to enclose, the sanction of Govt under Section 26 of the Religious and Charitable Institutions Act of 1927, for holding an enquiry into the alleged mismanagement of the Periyar Muttal Dekshan in Nanjanad taluk and to request that necessary proposals about

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *19* .

Date of issue 20.3.41

Signed by Asst S. K. V

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

the Constitution of the Committee
contemplated in the above Statutory
provision, may be sent for
the orders of your

Thanks

Yours Faithfully

For Secretary to Govt
19/7

No. C.1241/39-40.

Encls: Two.

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore, Dated 22nd August 1940.



From

Rukn-ul-Mulk S. ABDUL WAHID, Esq., B.A.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

To

H. V. Narayana Rao, Esq ; B.A.;LL.B.,
Law Secretary to the Government
of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

Mismanaged affairs of the Lingayet Mutt at Devanur, Nanjangud Taluk.
--oOo--

With reference to General Secretary's letter No.754/Muz. 100-38-4 dated 5th October 1938 conveying sanction to authorise the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, to make a reference to the District Judge, under Section 13 of the Mysore Religious and Charitable Institutions Act of 1927. in the above matter, and subsequent Government order No.1788-90/Muz.205-39-2 dated 10th February 1940 and this Office letter No.C.1241/39-40 dated 26th April 1940 addressed to the General Secretary to Government on the same subject, I have the honour to forward herewith a copy of letter No.M.282/38 dated 20th August 1940, with its enclosure, received from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, stating that the provision of Section 13 of the said Act does not apply to Mutts and other Institutions of a similar nature that the reference already made by him to the District Court is not maintainable and that sanction may be obtained to withdraw the reference. I request that immediate sanction or Government orders in this matter may be issued to the proposal of the Deputy Commissioner as early as possible as the case is posted to 27th instant. I have asked the Deputy Commissioner to take a short adjournment on the 27th if orders are not received by that date.

2) As regards the further action to be taken the Public Prosecutor suggests that action under Section 25 of the Religious and Charitable Trust

aken under Orders of Government, while the Deputy Commis-
ioner reports that Section 26 of the Act is the more
ppropriate provision for dealing with this case and that
he Government Advocate may be consulted in the matter.

3) In the above circumstances, I request that the views of
overnment in the Law Department may kindly be obtained and
urnished as to the further action to be taken in this case.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

BRN.

SECTION I.
No. H.282 of 38.
Encl.

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
MYSORE DISTRICT.

Dated, Mysore, the .....20th August..... *1940.*

FROM

K. SUBBA RAO, ESQ., B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District, Mysore.

To

Rukn-ul-Mulk
S. ABDUL WAJID, ESQ., B.A.,
Muzrai ~~Revenue~~ *Commissioner in Mysore,*
Bangalore.

SIR,

I have the honor to invite kind reference to the General Secretary's letter No.754/Muz.100-38-4 dated the 5th October 1939 to the Muzrai Commissioner conveying the sanction of Government to - authorise the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, to make a referen to the District Judge, Mysore, under Section 13 of the Mysore Religio and Charitable Institutions Act VII of 1927 in connection with the mi management of the Lingayet Mutt at Devanur in Nanjangud Taluk.

2. On receipt of the above order, I made a reference to the District Judge, Mysore, under Section 13 of the Act and instructed th Public Prosecutor to appear on behalf of the District Muzrai Officer. The Defendants have now filed a statement in the District Judge's Cou in which they allege that the institution at Devanur is not a Mutt at all but a samadhi. They also contend that the samadhi and properties belonging to it are the private property of the original founder and t they do not constitute a religious or charitable trust within the mean ing of the Act. There is plenty of material to prove that the Institution is a Charitable and Religious Trust, and that its affairs are being grossly mismanaged. I have set out the facts of the case in my report to the Muzrai Commissioner No.H.282 of 38-39 dated the 1st August 1939.

3. The Public Prosecutor now draws my attention to the provisions of the Act and points out that the Chapter III of the Act under which Section 13 occurs as also Chapter II does not apply to

Mathas and other institutions of a similar nature or to the property belonging to them, which are in the position of Mathadhipathis or other persons entitled to excercise powers of management or ownership (vide Section 24). He is therefore of opinion that the reference made to the District Judge is not maintainable. I enclose herewith for favour of perusal a copy of his note received to-day as also a copy of the statement filed by the Defendants. I discussed the question thoroughly with the Public Prosecutor and am inclined to agree with his view that the reference which has been made to the District Judge is not competent in law. Accordingly I recommend that sanction may kindly be accorded to withdraw the reference. The case stands posted to the 27th instant, for filing the plaintiff's reply to the Defendants' statement and I request that orders in the matter may be kindly communicated before that date.

4. If the reference is withdrawn the next question for consideration is what further action has to be taken in regard to this case. The Public Prosecutor suggests action under Section 25 of the Act. That section empowers Government to take over the possession and management of the property of any Mutt or other similar institution in the circumstances enumerated in clauses (1), (2) and (3) thereof. Clauses (1) and (3) have no application to the facts of this case. Clause (3) is applicable only when the Mathadhipathi is dead or has left the country and has not been heard of for more than 7 years and has not made legal and satisfactory arrangements for the carrying on of the ordinary business of the Institution and there is no successor duly appointed according to law or custom applicable to succession to the Office. I am doubtful whether the present case can be brought within the purview of this clause. This is not a case in which the Mathadhipathi is dead or left the country without making satisfactory arrangements nor is it possible to say that in the present case, there is no success or duly appointed according to law or custom. What we actually find is that Thondari Swamy, one of the defendants claims to be the Head of the Mutt with authority to give diksha. He is in actual possession of the Mutt

and Gurusiddappa, another Defendant is acting as Manager and is in possession of the properties belonging to the Mutt. I do not think there is sufficient material to come to the conclusion that Thondayari Swamy is not the lawful successor to the Office or that he was not duly appointed to that office in accordance with law or custom. The petitioners who are the disciples of the Mutt do not so much question the right of Thondayari Swamy to succeed to the Mutt and manage its properties. What they emphasise in their petition is that Thondyari Swami and Gurusiddappa are grossly mismanaging the affairs of the Mutt and are using its income as though the Mutt and its properties were their private and personal property. In this view of the matter it seems to me that Section 26 of the Act is the more appropriate provision of law for dealing with this case. I suggest that the Government Advocate may be kindly consulted in the matter and if he should agree with the opinion, I have expressed, I shall send up proposals for the appointment of a Committee of enquiry by Government.

I have, the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

Offic the Public Prosecutor,
Mysore District,

Dated, Mysore, the 15/20th Aug.,

Subject:- Devanoor Matha - Reference by the District Muzrai Office to the District Judge, Mysore, under Section 13 of the Religious and Charitable Institutions Act VII of 1927 - O.S.No. 9 of 1939-40 - competency of Reference and maintainability of suit.

Reference:Memo No.H.282 of 38 dated 2-12-39 from the District Muzrai Office, Mysore, to the Public Prosecutor, Mysore.

Confidential note submitted to the District Muzrai Offi Mysore District, Mysore.

Flag A is the letter of reference sent to the District J 39-40 enclosing a precis of the facts of the case and the Government 1 Order sanctioning the reference. The letter of reference is the plaint under Section 15 of the Religious and Charitable Institutions Act.

Flag B is the written statement of objections or defence filed by the persons in possession of the Matha and its properties and who are opposing the contention of the District Muzrai Officer.

The case is adjourned to 27-8-40 for filing the plaintiff's reply to the written statement of defence.

In supporting the above-noted reference I feel confronted with an insurmountable technical difficulty. Although the defendants have not pleaded a specific defence on that point, it strikes me that the reference made to the District Judge on the basis of which O.S.No.9 of 39-40 is registered as a suit, is not competent in law.

Act VII of 1927 is divided into six chapters. Chapter II is devoted to the control and management of Muzrai Institutions. The Devanoor Matha is not a 'Muzrai Institution' within the meaning of Section 2(13) (i) of the Act inasmuch as it enjoys no grant in perpetuity from public revenues and no inam is granted for its maintenance.

Chapter III deals with institutions other than muzrai institutions that might be taken under Government management under certain circumstances. It was under Section 13 of this Chapter that reference was made to the District Judge in the present case. The purpose of the reference was to ascertain the position of the Government vis-a-vis the Devanoor Matha and the locus standi of the Government to interfere in the affairs of that institution. The question for determination by the District Judge is to record a finding after taking evidence as to whether any charitable or religious trust has been actually created in respect of the institution called the Devanoor Matha.

Chapter IV is concerned with Mathas and similar institutions Section 34 excludes from the orbit of Chapters II and III Mathas and other institutions of similar nature and the property belonging to them which are in the possession of persons entitled by law or usage to exercise powers of management. The same section clearly lays down that the provisions of Chapters II and III shall not apply to Mathas and other similar institutions.

Under Section 25 ~~xx~~ the Government may take over the possession and the management of the property of such institutions under certain circumstances. Our contention in the present suit is that the previous head of the Matha viz., [illegible] died and no successor is duly appointed. The contention of the opposite side is that the persons now in possession are entitled to retain possession and powers of management according to custom and that at any rate the Government cannot interfere.

In Chapter IV no provision is made for an enquiry corresponding to the one indicated in Section 13 of the Chapter III. But on the other hand in Sections 26 and 27 of Chapter IV a very wholesome and effective remedy is prescribed but it can only be applied if the Government have reason to believe that the head of the institution has been grossly mismanaging the property or is otherwise guilty of malversation. Therefore Sections 26 and 27 do not apply to the present case unless it is established that the

the present head of the institution is recognised as such and he is found guilty of malversation. The only legal provision under which the Government may take over possession and management of the Devanoor Matha is Section 25. No enquiry is required to be made before implemting an order made by Government under Section 25. If a resumption order is made it may be appealable under Section 38 and revisable under Section 39. Any order passed under the Act by a Muzrai Officer or the Government may be set aside in a suit filed under Section 92 C.P.C.

It therefore seems to me that the present suit O.S.9 of 39-40 is not likely to succeed under the provisions of the Religious and Charitable Institutions Act. But in my opinion action may be taken on the executive side by the Government under Section 25(2) of the Act.

The contesting defendamts 1 to 3 have filed their written statement. They claim that the 'ಕಟ್ಟಡ' is their private property. If that should be their contention they will not be permitted to bring a suit under Section 92 C.P.C. They will have to bring a regular suit for possession and it is doubtful if a civil court could take comnizance of such a suit. (Vide Section 40 R.C.I. Act).

I may incidentally invite your attention to two aspects of the question relating to the Devanoor Matha.

The Government ordered an enquiry into the affairs on the basis of an application filed by the desciples under Sections 26 and 27 of the Act. In the course of that enquiry proof was adduced by the petitioners that the property belonging to the Matha was a trust. Mismanggement was also proved. Added to that, there was the adverse claim of the persons in possession of the institution that the institution was their private property and that they were free to deal with it as they liked. The materials thus collected by the Taluk Amildar were sufficient to enable the Government to order resumption under Section 25 of the Act.

In my humble opinion it is not too late even now for the Government to take action under Section 25 of the Act.

I request that this note may kindly be submitted to Government for their esteemed opinion and further instructions.

Sd/- K. Ramaswamy,

Public Prosecutor,
Mysore District.

'Copy'

Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

HRK-4.

IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT JUDGE, M Y S O R E.

O.S.9 of 39-40.

Plaintiff:- Defendants:-

The D.MO. Vs. Thondayari Swami and others.

Statement of the Defendants 1 to 4:

1. The plaintiff has no right to file this suit or to make this reference.

2. There is no Mutt. It is only a Samadhi. (Gaddige or shrine).

3. There is no religious or charitable endowment in dispute.

4. The Religious and Charitable endowments Act of 1927 does not apply to the matter in dispute.

5. Sree Guruswami who is entrusted was not a celibate sanyasi. He was married and the third and the fourth defendants, Guru Swami and Basavarajuswami are his lenial descendants, as the genealogy shows.

6. Sree Guruswami was married. His daughter, Alamma married Siddhalingadevaru and this couple gave birth to Sree Channabasavadevaru, who had a son Basavanna and a daughter Neelamma. This Basavanna leaves behind him two sons Guruswami, and Basavarajuswami, the third and the fourth defendant - respectively. Neelamma was married to Gurusiddhadevaru, the second defendant, and this couple gave birth to Sivalingamma who is married to the third defendant Guruswami. Sivappa Devaru has nothing to do with the matter in dispute.

7. Sri Guruswami left valuable properties and his grandson Sri Channabasavadevaru obtained a succession certificate and succeeded to his estate. The third and the fourth defendants are the heirs of Sri Channabasavadevaru by succession.

8. The grounds of reference are untenable and the suit is not maintainable.

9. The suit is therefore liable to be dismissed with the costs of these defendants.

'Copy'

for Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

HRK-4.

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

IMMEDIATE.
No. P. 1246-7/Laws

Dated, Bangalore. 29th August 1940.

From

The Chief Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore
~~XXXX~~
Law Department.

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

Subject: Mismanaged affairs of the Lingayet Mutt at Devanur Nanjangud Taluk - O.S.No. 9 of 39-40 on the file of the District Judge, Mysore.

With reference to your letter No.C.1241/39-40 dated 22nd August 1940 on the above subject, I am directed to request you to take a month's adjournment in the case, as opinion cannot be given, without the necessary records.

The connected records together with the pleadings in the case may be caused to be forwarded at an early date.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Sd/- H. V. NARAYANA RAO.
SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
LAW DEPARTMENT.

TN-3) Memo No. P. 1247/Laws
Dated, Bangalore, the 29th August 1940.

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Public Prosecutor, Mysore District, for information.

By Order,

For SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
LAW DEPARTMENT.

Diary No. of letter replied to..... .....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Date of issue 29/8/40

Signed by.. dlw K.P.P

List of enclosures... .....

..... by .....

Examined by.. .....

Immediate

Section

File No.

Serial No.

No. P.1246

To

The Munsif Commissioner in Mysore, Bangalore

Subject :- His managed affairs of the Lingayat Mutt at Devanur, Nanjangud Taluk - CS no 9 of 39-40 on the file of the District Judge, Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter no C.1241/39-40 dated 22 nd August 1940 on the above subject, I am directed to request you to take a month's adjournment in the case, as the Optum cannot be proceeded without necessary records.

The connected records together with the pleadings in the case may be caused to be forwarded at an early date, ~~as they are necessary for arriving at a decision in the matter under reference~~.

I have etc.

P.1267

In reply to your ~~xxx~~ no

Copy to PMr Mysore District for information

By order

In Secy to Govt Law Dept

WD 0563—GPB—30,000—6-1-39

1487/40
P 1247

SECY. LAW DEPT. Law 2 SEP. 1940 GOVT OF MYSORE

WD 05858—GPB—35,000—8-5-40

From 19 .

The Public Procecutor,
Mysore District,
Mysore.

To

The Secretarty to the Govt.of
H.H.the Maharaja of Mysore
Law Department,
Bangalore.

Dated 31-8-1940.

Despatched 31-8-1940.

Received

General No. 1178

No.

Enclosure No. one file of 15 papers.

Subject: Mismanaged affairs of the Lingayet Mutt at Devanur, Nanjangud Taluk - O.S.No.9 of 39-40 on the file of the District Judge, Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your memo No.P.1247 Law dated the 29th instant forwarding copy of letter addressed to the Muzrai Commissioner on the above subject calling for the connected records together with pleadings in the case, I have the honour to state that the records were produced to the District Judge's Court along with the letter of reference made by the District Muzrai Officer under Section 13 of Act VII of 1927. Under Sec.15 of the Act the letter of reference must be treated as the plaint. Copy of the letter of reference together with its enclosures and the copy of the written statement are submitted herewith.

The case stands adjourned to 12-9-40 for filing our reply. If it is the desire of the Government that the records filed to Court must be taken back a

a ~~petition~~ return application will be made and the records will be transmitted to Government.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

T R Ramachandra

Public Prosecutor,
Mysore Division.

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat.

No. P 1440

Dated, Bangalore,.....30th.....September 1940.

FROM

The Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.
Law Department.

To

osecutor,
Mysore District,
Mysore.

Subject:- Mismanaged affairs of the Lingayat Mutt at Devanur-Nanjangud Taluk.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.P.478 dated 31st August 1940 on the above subject, I am directed to request that all the relevant records necessary for the purpose of arriving at a decision on the point at issue at present in the case may be taken back and forwarded to Government for reference and return and that a month's adjourment may be taken in the case.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

h

for Secretary to Government,
Law Department.

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section

File No.

, Serial No ~~P 1440~~

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

No. P·1440'

To

The public Prosecutor

Mysore District Mysore.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *19*

Subject:- Mismanaged affairs of the Lingayat Mutt at Devanur - Nanjangud Taluk

Date of issue 3/9/1960

Signed by dw K.P.P

Sir,

With reference to your letter no P 478 dated 31st August 1960 on the above subject I am directed to request that all the relevant records necessary for the purpose of arriving at a decision on the point at issue at present in the case may be taken back and forwarded to Govt for reference and return; and that a month's adjournment may be taken

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

WD 03695—GPB—30 000—29 1-40

I have etc.

Yrs

Forward to your Law Dept

SECY. LAW DEPT. 16 SEP. 1940 GOVT OF M

1838/40

WD 05858—GHB—85,000—3 5-40

1940-41.

From

The Public Prosecutor,
Mysore District,
Mysore.

To

The Secretary to the Govt.of
H.H.the Maharaja of Mysore
Law Department,
Bangalore.

79

Dated 14-9-40.

Despatched do

Received

General No.

No. 558.

Enclosure No. 4. files & 1 book

(By Registered Post)

Sir,

Subject: Mismanaged affairs of the Lingayat Mutt at Devanoor, Nanjangud Taluk - O.S.9/39-40 on the file of the Dist.Judge, Mysore.

With reference to copy of your letter No.P.1246/Law dated the 29th ultimo addressed to the Muzrai Commissioner on the above-noted subject, sent to me for submission of the records of the case, I have the honour to submit herewith 4 files of papers and a book taken from court yesterday. The receipt of the enclosures may kindly be acknowledged.

The pleadings were submitted with letter No.478 dated 30-8-40.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

K.Ramaswamy

Public Prosecutor,
Mysore District.

1940 September 1940.

The

Law Department.

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

Subject: Mismanaged affairs of the Lingayet Mutt at Devanur, Nanjangud Taluk. O.S.No.9 of 39-40 on the file of the District Judge, Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.C.1241/39-40 dated 22nd August 1940 on the above subject, I am directed to state that as the defendants contest that the institution is not a Mutt and not a public charitable or Religious Institution, it is necessary to get a judicial pronouncement on the said points. Hence the reference made under section 13 of the Mysore Religious and Charitable Institutions Act is quite proper, and as such, the case need not be withdrawn.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Sd/- H. V. Narayana Rao.
Secretary to Government,
Law Department.

TN)

Memo No.P. 1657/Law/Encls 4 files + one book Dt 9-9-40

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Public Prosecutor, Mysore District for information together with the pleadings and four files of papers and a book received with his letters dated 31-8-40 and 14-9-40.

By Order,

For Secretary to Government,
Law Department

SUBJECT....

Diary No. of letter replied to...

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *19* .

Date of issue 19.9.60

Signed by K.P.P

List of enclosures .

Copied by

Examined by...

Section

File No.

Serial No.

No. 116 56/Cám

To

The Manager commissioner

in Mysore, Bangalore.

Subject:- Mismanaged affairs of the Lingayat Mutt at Devanur, Nanjangud Taluk- CS no 9 of 39.60 on the file of the District Judge Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your letter no C 1241/39.60 dated 22nd August 1960 on the above subject, I am directed to state that ~~it is necessary that a judicial pronouncement be obtained in the case already filed. There is no necessity to withdraw the reference~~

that the institution is not a Mutt and not a a public Charitable or Religious Institution. Hence the reference ~~already~~ made under section 13 of the Mysore Religious and Charitable Institutions Act is quite proper, & as such, the case need not be withdrawn.

I have etc.

Sd/-

Sr Secy to Govt Law Dept.

A copy of the above is forwarded with Compliments to the public prosecutor Mysore District for information together with the pleadings and four files of papers and a book received with his letters dated 31-8 1960 and 16-9-1960.

By order -

Sr Secy to Govt Law Dept

It is necessary to get a judicial pronouncement ~~in the case above~~ on points ~~set forth above~~. to represent on X.

SECY. LAW DEPT
15 JAN. 1941
GOVT. OF MYSORE

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MYSORE DISTRICT.

3. Mysore Dated 13-1- 1941.

151

From

THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
Mysore District, MYSORE.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
Law Department, BANGALORE.

Subject- C.C. No. 9/39-40 (District Mugavai Officer Mysore by T. Rama Rao & others) on the file of the District Judge Mysore — Dewanny suit case.

SIR,

I have the honour to report that the above-noted case has been ~~adjourned to~~ dismissed and each party is directed to bear his own cost. Copy of the order will be obtained and submitted for perusal.

~~submitted for perusal.~~ The receipt of the Copy of order will be awaited.

29/1

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

Public Prosecutor, Mysore District.

SECY. LAW DEPT. Law 4 JAN. 1941 GOVT OF MYSORE

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MYSORE DISTRICT,

Mysore, Dated 2 [illegible] 194 /.

Law 4 JAN. 1941

THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
Mysore District, MYSORE.

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
Law Department, BANGALORE.

O.S. 9/39-40 (District Bangalore officer appointed to T. Narasipura) on the file of the District Judge Mysore. —— Devanoor suit case

SIR,

I have the honour to report that the above-noted case has been adjourned to 9 1 41 for orders on the application to bring the devotees of the matt on record.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

[signature]

Public Prosecutor, Mysore District.

that the ms
not a a fm
Institution
made under
Reservoirs and
is quite proper
be withdrawn

Copy of the a
Compliments
Allegore Distri
with the ple
papers and a
letters dated 3.

By order -

Secy to Govt Law Dept

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MYSORE DISTRICT,

Mysore, Dated 23.12. 1940.

THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
Mysore District, MYSORE.

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
Law Department, BANGALORE.

Subject: O No 9/39-40 (District Magistrate Officer Mysore
vs T Adiniah & ors) on the file of the District Judge Mys.
— Devanoor Mutt Case

SIR,

I have the honour to report that the above-noted case has been adjourned to 2.1.41 for arguments.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

P.S. Chandrasekhara Iyengar

Public Prosecutor, Mysore District.



OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PROSECUTO
MYSORE DISTRICT,

Mysore, Dated 13 12 194

From

THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,

Mysore District, MYSORE.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
Law Department, BANGALORE.

Subject:

SIR

I have the honour to report that the above-noted case has been adjourned to

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

Public Prosecutor, Mysore District.

3491/40

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MYSORE DISTRICT,

Mysore, Dated 3-12- 1940.

From

THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
Mysore District, MYSORE.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
Law Department, BANGALORE.

Subject: O. 9/39-40 (District Magistrate Office-Ht Channel Voting) with file from District Judge Mysore — Devanoor Mutt case

SIR,

I have the honour to report that the above-noted case has been adjourned to 12-12-40 for reply and arguments.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

K. Ramaswamy

Public Prosecutor, Mysore District.

SECT. LAW DE 21 NOV. 1940 GOVT OF MYSORE

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MYSORE DISTRICT,

Mysore, Dated 19

From

THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,

Mysore District, MYSORE, NOV. 1940

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
Law Department, BANGALORE.

Subject: C M 9/35-40 (Sri Amb. Mugavai Officer Mysore vs T. Ramachandra) Settlement file of the District Munsiff Mysore — Devanoor Matt Case.

SIR,

I have the honour to report that the above-noted case has been adjourned to 3.12.1940 for filing reply to the defence Statement.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

Public Prosecutor, Mysore District.

~~at this stage~~
that the ins
not a a pro
Institution
made under
Reservoirs and
is quite proper
be withdrawn

Copy of the a
Arrangements
Glasgow Corpo
with the pla
papers and a
letters dated

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MYSORE DISTRICT,

Mysore, Dated 22.10.



From

THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
Mysore District, MYSORE,

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
Law Department, BANGALORE.

Hm 25/10 3 5/10

Subject: C. 9/39-40 (District Magistrate Officer Mysore Vs T. Ramiah others) and file of the District Magistrate Mysore — Devanoor theft case

SIR,

I have the honour to report that the above-noted case has been adjourned to 19-11-40 On account of Mysore Sessions.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

K. B. Rama Rao

Public Prosecutor, Mysore District.

20 SEP. 1940
GOVT OF MYSORE

Office of the Public Prosecutor
Mysore District Mysore
18/9/40.

The Public
Mysore District.
Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Government of H. H. the Maharaja
Mysore Law Department, Bangalore

Subject:— C. C. 9/38-40 (District Magistrate Officer Mr. T. Ramiah
others) on the file of the District Court Mysore — Dewanoor
Theft Case.

Sir,

I have the honour to report that the above-noted case has been adjourned to 21.10.40 as prayed for.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
K. V. Ramaswamy
Public Prosecutor

The Public Prosecutor
Law Mysore District Mysore
J 28/8/40

LAW DEPT.
29 AUG. 1940
GOVT O M PRE.

The Public
Mysore District
Mysore

To
The Secretary to the Government of H. H. the Maharaja
of Mysore Law Section, Bangalore.

Subject:— C.S. No 9/35-40 (District Magistrate Officer Mysore Vs
T Ramiah & Ors) on the file of the District Judge
Mysore — Devanoor Petition Case.

Sir,

I have the honour to report that the above mentioned
Case has been adjourned to 18-9-40 for filing reply.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
K Ramaswamy
Public Prosecutor

No. 2/C Office of the Public Prosecutor,
Mysore District,
Mysore, dated 1. 8. 1940.

Law
2 AUG. 1940.
T OF MYSORE

The Public Prosecutor,
Mysore District,
Mysore.

Law
1 AUG 1940

To

The Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Law Department, Bangalore.

Subject: Cmo 9/39-40 (District Magistrate Officer Vs Ramiah & Ors) on the file of the District Judge Mysore — Devanoor suit case.

Sir,

I have the honour to report that the above-noted case has been adjourned to 27-8-40 on account of Mysore Sessions.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

K Ramakant

Public Prosecutor,
Mysore District.

From The Public Prosecutor
Mysore District Mysore

To 2417

Office of the Public Prosecutor
Mysore District Mysore
22 DEC 1940

The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore
Law Deptt. Bangalore



Subject:- O.S 9/39.40 (Dist Munz Officer Mysore Vs. T.N. Ramaiya & Others) before the Dist Judge, Mysore — Devanur Mutt Case

Sir,

I have the honour to report that objections to the plaintiffs application for impleading certain people as defendants, were filed today. The case is posted on 29.7.40 for filing reply thereto



I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

Public P.

6 JULY 1940
GOVT OF MYSORE

Mysore District Mysore
Dt 4-7-40.

The Public Prosecutor
Mysore District
Mysore

The Secretary to the Government of H.H. the Maharaja
of Mysore, Law Department, Bangalore.

Subject O.S. No 9/39-40 (District Magistrate Officer Mysore
vs Ramesh Sons) on the file of the District Judge
Mysore Devanoor matt case.

Sir,

I have the honour to report that the above noted
has been adjourned to 22-7-40 for written statement
& objections to I.A. No III.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

Public Prosecutor

Public Prosecutor
Mysore Division Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Govt.
Law Department, Bangalore

O.S. 9/39.40 (Dist Mysr. Office
Vs. T. Ramiah & Others) before the Dist
Judge Mysore — Devanoor Murder Case

Sir,

I have the honour to report that the above noted case has been posted to 25.6.40 for account of Mysore Sessions

I have the honour to be.
Sir
Your most obedient servant

Public Prosecutor

LEGY. LAW DEPT.
1 JUNE 1940
GOVT OF MYSORE

Hm
14/6

Ans. C

Hum
7/6.

JUNE 1940

The Public Prosecutor
Mysore Division,
Mysore

Mysore Division, Mysore
14.6.40.

To

The Secretary to the Government of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore, Law Department Bangalore

Subject:— C.C. 9/39-40 (District Magazine Officer Mysore Vs T. Ramiah & Sons on the file of the District Court Mysore — Dewanoor Mutt Case

Sir,

I have the honour to report that the above-noted case has been adjourned to 11.6.40 to make an application to bring all parties as defendants as a Representative suit.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

K. Ramachandra Rao

Public Prosecutor

1620-5 782

Office of the Public Prosecutor,
Mysore Division,
Dated 29-5- 1940.

rom

L. LAW DEPT.
31 MAY 1940
GOVT OF MYSORE

The Public Prosecutor,
Mysore Division, Mysore.

M 31/5

The Secretary to the Government of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore
Law Department, Bangalore.

Subject:- C.9/39-40 (District Magistrate Office Mysore Vs T.M. Ramiah
others) on the file of the District Court Mysore — Advancement

Sir,

I have the honour to state that the above noted case has been adjourned to 4-6-40 for the convenience of the Court was engaged in Sessions work.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

T.M. Ramiah

Public Prosecutor

3K.
22 MAY 1940
GOVT OF MYSORE

From.

The Public Prosecutor
Mysore Division
Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Government of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore Law Department Bangalore.

Subject:— D. no 9/35-40 (Direct Magisterial appeal of T. M Ramiah & others) on the file of the District Judge Mysore — Devanoor Murthy case

Sir,

I have the honour to report that the above noted case has been adjourned to 28.5.1940 for arguments on P.A II.

Submitted for perusal

I/5

Yours obedient servant

K. Ramaswamy

Public Prosecutor

The Public Prosecutor
Mysore Division, Mysore
21-

EXECUTIVE & REVENUE FORT

22 MAY 1940

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MYSORE DIVISION,

Dated - 13. 5. 40 -

From Hm/1515 3/10/57

THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MYSORE DIVISION,
MYSORE.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore
Law Department
Bangalore

Subject:— O.S. 9/39-40 (Dy. Asst. Officer Vs T.N. Ramaiya & Others) before the Dist Judge, Mysore

Sir,

I have the honour to report that the above noted case has been adjourned to 20.5.40 for filing objections to the application of Thontadarya Swamy & others for vacating the order appointing a Receiver pedente lite.

Submitted for perusal

Kuse 16/5

3/10/57

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servent,

Public Prosecutor.

5899 6123/P834

Office of the Public Prosecutor
Mysore Division, Mysore
18-3-40.



The Public Prosecutor
Mysore Division,
Mysore

The Secretary to the Government of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore
Law Department, Bangalore.

Subject:— P.C. No 9/39-40 (District Magazine Officer Mysore & T.M. Ramiah & others) on the file of the District Court Mysore — Detention Matter case.

Sir,

I have the honour to report that the above noted case has been adjourned to 3.5.40 for service of summons to the unrepresented defendants.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
K. [illegible]

Secy C
20-3-40

Off

Division? Mysore.

GOVT OF MYSORE

H 2/3

The Public Prosecutor,
Mysore Division, Mysore.

To The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore
Law Dept. Bangalore.

Subject:- O.S. 9/39-40 (Dist. Munc. Officer Vs. Ramiah & others) before the District Judge, Mysore - Devanur Mutt Case.

Sir,

I have the honour to report that the above noted case has been adjourned to 18.3.40 for furnishing process and address of the unrepresented defendants

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

K. Rama Rao

Public Prosecutor,
Mysore.

WS C
9-3-40

Public Prosecutor
respectfully,
begs.



The Secretary to the Government of H.H. The Maharaja
respectfully Law Department, Bangalore

Sir No 9/39-40 on the file of the District Judge Bangalore
Devaroor Suit Case.

I have the honour to report that the above noted case has been adjourned to 4.3.40 for filing a list of defendants to be served with summons.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant
L. Ramaswamy
Public Prosecutor

To

The Secretary to
H. H. the Maharaja of
Law Department,

T. Ramachandra
Public Prosecutor
Mysore

Asstt:
OY LAW DEP.

Mysore Division

SECRETARIAT
8 FEB. 1940

To:- The Secretary to Government
Law-Department
Bangalore,

No:- 1584 Dt 5-2-40

Subject:- O.S. 9/39-40; District Court,
(District Munsif officer,
Mysore vs Y. Ramaiah)

Sir,

I have the honour to report that the above noted case has been adjourned to 13-2-40, account of Mamulya Session Case

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
K Ramachandra
Public Prosecutor